



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Che-Yuan CHANG Confirmation No: 9681  
Appl. No. : 10/800,616  
Filed : March 16, 2004  
Title : WRINKLED NET FOR CLEANING IMPLEMENT AND  
PRODUCT THEREOF  
  
TC/A.U. : 1744  
Examiner : M. Spisich  
  
Docket No.: : CHAN3245/REF  
Customer No: : 23364

**RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Official Action of February 13, 2007, in connection with the above-identified application. The period for response to this Official Action has been extended to expire on June 13, 2007, by the filing herewith of a Petition for a One Month Extension of Time and payment of the required fee.

The Official Action is a rejection to claims 1-4 in which it is urged that they are anticipated by Ching-Chen (US Pub 2003/0236045) under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the following comments.

Applicants wish to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of